REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 13, and 15 are the independent claims.

Initially, Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 1-5 are allowed. None of the aforementioned allowed claims has been amended and Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of Claims 1-5 remains in condition for allowance.

Pending Claims 6-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,152 (Ohnishi, et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,069,624 (Dash, et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of independent Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn at least because the cited art does not teach or suggest the features of:

> input means for inputting an instruction to execute a job and whether the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job; and

> informing means for informing the external device of the result of the job processing executed by said processing means through said connection means when the external device is to be informed of the result of the job processing.

The rejection of independent Claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn at least because the cited art does not teach or suggest the features of

> determining if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input; and

> informing an external device connected to said data processing apparatus of the discriminated result to the job if said determining

- 6 -

step determines that the external device is to be informed of the
result of the job.

Thus, at least for these reasons, the cited art does not render independent Claims 6, 13, or 15

obvious.

Ohnishi. et al. relates to a system for allocating data output requests to output units

having different output formats in accordance with data output format compatibility and priority

characteristic and teaches displaying system status messages on a user interface. However,

Ohnishi, et al. lacks a teaching or suggestion of input means for inputting an instruction to execute

a job and whether the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job

(Claim 6) or determining if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input

(Claims 13 and 15). Indeed, as the Office Action notes, Ohnishi, et al. merely teaches "[i]nput

means . . . for inputting an instruction (i.e., request) to execute a job . . .." (Office Action, page 2).

Recognizing this deficiency in Ohnishi, et al., Dash, et al. is cited to supply the

missing feature. The Office Action asserts that Dash, et al. teaches "input means for inputting an

instruction to execute a job and a status request signal from the user interface . . ." and Col. 5,

lines 53-67, Col. 6, lines 39-45, Col. 7, lines 45-60, and Col. 11, lines 32-34 of that patent are

cited in support. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Dash,et al. do

not support the features of input means for inputting an instruction to execute a job and whether

the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job (Claim 6) or
                                                                    o
determining if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input (Claims 13

and 15).

Applicants understand Dash, et al. to merely disclose, at best, that a user interface 3

displays control data relating to a manner in which a job is to be processed and that a video

control module (VCM) 16 coordinates operation a scanner 18 and printer. In the Dash, et al. system, the user interface includes a display screen (e.g., 300 in Figure 7) that is configured to display line messages intended to convey information regarding the status of various processing jobs. (Col. 5, line 53 - Col. 6, line 14). However, Dash, et al. lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining, based on an input, if an external device should be informed of the result and informing an external device connected to said data processing apparatus of the discriminated result to the job if said determining step determines that the external device is to be informed of the result of the job. Applicants submit that Col. 5, lines 53-67 of Dash, et al. merely relates to the manner in which line messages are displayed on the user interface. Further, Applicants submit that Col. 6, lines 39-45 and Col. 7, lines 45-60 of Dash, et al. merely teach various line message IDs. Indeed, Applicants note that those portions of Dash, et al. are preceded by the following paragraph which explains that the function and purpose of each message ID:

> Line message behavior is controlled by assigning a message ID to
> each message. The message ID contains a set of embedded codes
> [or indicators] which identify the pathway, line, priority and length
> of time the message is to be displayed.

(Col 6, lines 19-23). As for Col. 11, lines 32-34, that portion of Dash, et al. merely teaches that a Print Queue screen displays information required by the user to complete a print job. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Dash, et al. does not add anything to the teachings of Ohnishi, et al. to remedy the above-noted deficiency. Thus, for at least this reason, Dash, et al. does not render the aforesaid features independent Claims 6, 13 or 15 obvious.

Applicants also submit that the Office has not articulated the requisite motivation to combine the cited art. Thus, for this additional reason, independent Claims 6, 13, and 15 are patentable over the cited art.

Applicants submit that independent Claims 6, 13 and 15 patentably define the present invention over the cited art. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as the base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite.

This Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MEK/tmc